

REMARKS

The remarks of prior responses, insofar as relevant are incorporated herein.

Claim I has been amended to emphasize that the final communication includes any and all of the human modifications.

In the office action, all claims have been rejected under 35 USC 103 over previously cited Pollack in view of newly cited Fahlman (US 5,960,080).

In contention, it is pointed out that contra to the examiner's assertion in item 5, and as with the previously applied and subsequently withdrawn reference Powers, Fahlman teaches as a whole that the initial communication/message is always (temporarily) modified (steps 103/203) - by replacement of removed sensitive information by tokens for transmission (to an untrusted service). The modification step must always occur as (at least one item) of sensitive information identified by the review must be removed/replaced from the communication before passing the communication to the untrusted service.

On the other hand, the modification is undone by restoration of the sensitive information when the translated message is sent to the recipient so that the intended recipient actually receives only a translation of the original information (initial communication) without modification.

This latter difference illustrates the patentable distinctness of the concept underlying the claimed invention from, in particular, the concept taught by the secondary reference - the whole teaching of which requires restoration of the message content to its original form - that prior to modification - as otherwise the recipient will not receive the requisite sensitive information at all - in contrast to the claimed invention where all the modifications must be retained in the communication sent to the recipient .

In contrast to the whole teaching of the secondary reference, Pollock teaches only transmission to a recipient without any review for possible amendment, while the secondary reference Fahlman teaches transmission to a recipient necessarily

requiring such review step. Neither reference discloses or suggests that such review is optional -being conditional on the content of stored data extracted when composing the initial communication.

It is further emphasized that the teaching as a whole of each reference requires a pre-existing document as a starting point for each of their methods (with the secondary reference requiring modification of the pre-existing document with the intention of later returning it back to its original form. In contrast, however, according to the claimed invention properly considered as a whole, there is no pre-existing document as a starting point, but only a data source (the transaction data) and a communication/document template containing the document assembly rules - the initial communication is automatically composed in response to the stored data. As there is no pre-existing state, there is no need for reconstitution or return of the communication to that state

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of obviousness is inappropriate.

Favourable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Robert W.J. Usher/

Robert W.J. Usher
Customer 04518; Reg 30932
212 633 1076